REMARKS

Claims 2-4, 14, 16-18, 28, 30-32 and 42-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonder et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,265) in view of Cregger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,384,711 B1), Weiss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,522,240 B1) and further in view of Desai (U.S. Patent No. 6,377,173). In response, Applicant amended the independent claims to clarify that the key information outputted to the key information retaining device is less likely to be intercepted than the information contained in the wireless signal received from the key information retaining device, and respectfully traverse the rejection based on these amendments.

As shown in FIG. 1 of the present application, a key information issuing device 1 transmits information to a remote controller 2 or key information retaining device. Additionally, the remote controller 2 transmits information to the key information issuing device 1. Advantageously, when key information is outputted to the key information retaining device, the key information is less likely to be intercepted than the information contained in the wireless signal received from the key information retaining device. This is because the encryption key is transmitted via a safe communication path that prevents an interception or wire tapping. (See Applicant's Specification page 9, lines 11-23).

More specifically, the present invention includes a key information transfer route (an output module outputting the key information to the key information retaining device) and an encrypted wireless information receiving route (a receiving module receiving wireless signals from the key information retaining device). Thus, the system of the present

invention has two independent interfaces between the key information issuing device and the key information retaining device. Because of these different interfaces, the key information outputted to the key information retaining device is less subject to an interception than the information contained in the wireless signal received from the key information retaining device.

The cited references fail to disclose or suggest two separate interfaces as disclosed in the present invention. Thus, the cited references are unable to have key information outputted to a key information retaining device that is less likely to be intercepted than information contained in a wireless signal received from a key information retaining device. Accordingly, even if combined, the cited prior art references cannot achieve the advantage of the present invention, namely, improved interception security when transferring key information to a wireless remote. For these reasons, withdrawal of the §103 rejection is respectfully requested.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that this Application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

January 5, 2006
300 South Wacker Drive Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978
P:\DOCS\3169\66103\9U1301.DOC

By Joseph P. Fox
Joseph P. Fox
Registration No. 41,760